7 <u>and framework for a fully functioning offline server</u>

8 <u>for offline operation of a client browser</u>

9 responsive to said database, distributing user

10 identifiers selectively based upon security domain

11 through auto generation, directory lookup or user

12 prompt.

REMARKS

The above amendment and these remarks are responsive to the communication from Examiner S. Pannala dated 26 Feb 2003, and designed FINAL.

Claims 1-22 are in the case, none having been allowed.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings, noting that in Figure 24 "necessary textual labels of features or symbols", and suggested that by "placing an arrow between elements to indicate direction of flow of of Fig. 24, would

give the viewer necessary detail to fully understand this process flow at a glance."

Applicants submit herewith a replacement Figure 24, showing the arrows as suggested by the Examiner, for entry in the case by the Drawing Review Branch subject to the approval of the Examiner.

The Examiner also referred to "descriptive textual label for each numbered element in these figures" and "any structural detail that is of sufficient importance to be described should be shown in the drawing." Applicants are not aware of any textual labels or structural details needing addition to or correction in the drawings, and request that the Examiner withdraw or clarify this apparent objection.

35 U.S.C. 102

Claims 1-2 and 4-22 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by McGee (US Patent 6,393,468).

Applicants invention is about offline web applications.

That is, applicants provide to client browsers multiple offline subscriptions that replicate securely, each subscription including client-side runtimes and frameworks that let a user interact with the application of the website when unplugged, that is, offline with respect to the website, in a manner that is secure and that has data-integrity through replication and synchronization.

Applicants have amended the independent claims to clarify that the subscription being claimed contains client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server for offline operation of a client browser.

With McGee, an end user can only use the web experience with the browser connected to the net. Unplug the net connection, and the user is unable to function. The browser in McGee has a cache of read-only pages, none of which execute the server's database or page-transition logic. So, unplugged, the user is unable to interact with the application of the website.

Applicants define "subscription" at page 24, lines 11-17 as follows:

"A subscription is... a secured (that is, ACL protected) database or collection of databases containing off-line web applications with synchronization schedules and with which an authorized user may interact, either on-line or with an off-line instantiation."

There is no teaching in McGee of a "subscription", as applicants have defined the term. Unplug McGee from the web, and the browser is unable to interact with the web application.

Applicants urge that claims 1-2 and 4-22 be allowed over McGee.

35 U.S.C. 103

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over McGee, in view of Forbes et al. (U. S. Patent 6,381,742).

The McGee reference is about how a web server enforces logins and then uses those logins for optimizing its caching. The Forbes references is about incremental

installers of application logic using XML. Neither teach applicants invention which provides subscriptions containing client-side runtime and framework for a fully functioning offline server for offline operation of a client browser.

Applicants have previously explained the distinction to be drawn between claim 3 (which depends from claim 2) and McGee.

With respect to Forbes, Forbes teaches at Col. 12:29-14:3 a manifest for incremental installation of application logic onto a machine using XML and namespaces. There is no teaching of a "subscription" as that term has been defined by applicants in the parent claim and discussed previously with respect to McGee.

Applicants urge that claim 3 also be allowed.

Response to Arguments

The Examiner states that McGee teaches the concept of subscription at column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 37.

Applicants traverse this characterization of McGee.

There is no teaching here in McGee of how to build the code for a laptop to take a fully functioning snapshot of the online server "to go" - which is what applicants' subscription provides. As previously noted, unplug McGee's client from the web and there is no access to the web application as is provided by applicants' subscription.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

Applicants urge that the above amendments be entered and the case passed to issue with claims 1-22.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephone conversation with applicant(s) attorney could possibly facilitate prosecution of the case, he may be reached at the number noted below.

Sincerely,

C. J. Kraenzel, et al.

By

Shelley M Beckstrand
Shelley M Beckstrand
Reg. No. 24,886

Date: 24 May 2002

Shelley M Beckstrand, P.C.
Attorney at Law
314 Main Street
Owego, NY 13827

Phone: (607) 687-9913
Cell: (607) 427-0802